

Serial No. 10/548,318

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-14 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 11, and 13, objected to claim 2, and allowed claims 4-10, 12, and 14. By this Amendment, claim 2 has been amended to merely correct a typographical error. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-14 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 2 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,474,827, issued to Shinohara et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Shinohara"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites at least a part of an emission face providing an emission promotion surface which has a plurality of first slopes and a plurality of second slopes, said first slopes being arranged repeatedly at intervals along a direction from said incidence side end face towards said distal side face, the second slopes being arranged as to fill up the intervals respectively. The Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation of this structure is not disclosed or suggested by Shinohara. Further, claim 1 recites each of the first slopes being inclined as to have a normal leaning to the distal side face, and each of the second slopes being inclined as to have a normal leaning to the incidence side end face and to be steeper than adjacent first slopes on both sides thereof. These features regarding the inclinations applied to the respective first and second slopes are also not disclosed or suggested by Shinohara.

Shinohara discloses an image display apparatus to improve brightness using a surface light source device with high directionality in the emitted light, capable of limiting the direction of emitted light within a narrow range. However, Shinohara fails to disclose any light guide plate which satisfies the structure of the light guide plate recited above. Almost all of the light guide plates in Shinohara (Figures 13, 17, 19, etc.) illustrate slopes which run perpendicularly along the emission face. In other words, the slopes run from the incidence side end face towards the distal side face, which is opposite to the direction recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner has identified that the slopes 57 in the light guide plate illustrated in Figure 35 do run parallel with the incident side end face 53.

Serial No. 10/548,318

The Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the slopes 57 illustrated in Figure 35 do not disclose or suggest the recited feature of the first slopes being inclined as to have a normal leaning to the distal side face, and the second slopes being inclined as to have a normal leaning to the incidence side end face and to be steeper than the adjacent first slopes on both sides thereof. In fact, the slopes 57 shown in Figure 35 seem to be of the same inclination and length to one another. Further, Shinohara explicitly discloses that the deflecting pattern 57 is uniform in the direction of the Y-axis with triangular cross-sectional shapes covering the entire light emitting surface 56 of the light conducting plate (Column 10, Lines 49-63). Therefore, it is apparent that there are second slopes of the pattern 57 that are steeper than the adjacent first slopes.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of Shinohara is in direct contrast with the light guide plate recited in claim 1. Although the Examiner has cited Column 10, Lines 34-43 as apparent evidence that the second slopes are inclined as to be steeper than the first slopes, the Applicant respectfully fails to understand how this is relevant to the features recited in claim 1. The section cited by the Examiner merely describes the alternative placement of deflection pattern 57 and converging pattern 58. However, neither of these patterns discloses or suggests such a structural arrangement as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, as Shinohara does not disclose at least these recited features of claim 1, and the Examiner has provided no allegation whatsoever of any obviousness that would be implied by a §103 rejection, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Shinohara.

Claims 3, 11, and 13 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by Shinohara. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3, 11, and 13 also patentably distinguish over Shinohara.

Allowable Subject Matter

In item 4 on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to claim 2, but indicated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As discussed in the previous sections of this Amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Shinohara. Further, claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by

Serial No. 10/548,318

Shinohara. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 also patentably distinguishes over Shinohara

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 2 has been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-14 remain pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 10, 2007By: Thomas L. JonesThomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Patents,
R.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on 10/10, 2007

STAAS & HALSEY

By: Thomas L. JonesDate: 10/10/07